

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT LINDBLAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

WALGREENS CORPORATIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [21-cv-07507-TSH](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On September 28, 2021 the Court granted Plaintiff Robert Lindblad's in forma pauperis application and screened his complaint, finding he failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). ECF No. 4. The Court found Lindblad's complaint does not comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 because it is unclear who he intends to sue and what claims he seeks to bring against each potential defendant. Although Lindblad names Walgreens, Starbucks, and Arapahoe County Government as defendants, there are no factual allegations related to Arapahoe County, other than a general allegation related to a conspiracy to infiltrate corporations. Further, Plaintiff also names Zeta Street Gang and "an undisclosed intelligence agency" as members of the conspiracy, but he does not name them as defendants. Lindblad's complaint also does not identify or adequately describe any claim or claims he seeks to bring against these defendants (or even whether they are intended as defendants), and it does not clearly connect any of the facts alleged in the complaint to any of them. The Court directed Lindblad to file an amended complaint by October 28, 2021 and "state as clearly as possible the facts giving rise to the complaint. He must also explain why each named defendant is being sued by making specific factual allegations that connect each defendant with the alleged wrongdoing, and specifically identifying the claim(s) asserted against each defendant."

1 Lindblad has now filed a motion for an injunction under Rule 65, stating he has 11 cases
2 pending in this district and requesting Chief Judge Richard Seeborg issue an injunction against
3 “clerks, magistrates, and judges” because they “have committed unlawful acts and/or federal
4 questions around their actions.” ECF No. 11. He argues that “[i]f clerks, magistrates, and judges
5 the plaintiff is using, persist to engage in bias decisions around the plaintiff’s cases, a continuous
6 stream of injustice will accrue.”

7 In the meantime, Lindblad has not filed an amended complaint as ordered, and he has
8 therefore failed to comply with court-ordered deadlines. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**
9 Plaintiff Robert Lindblad to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to
10 prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines. Lindblad shall file a declaration by
11 November 12, 2021. If a responsive declaration is filed, the Court shall either issue an order based
12 on the declaration or conduct a hearing on December 2, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. by Zoom video
13 conference. The webinar link and instructions are located at
14 <https://cand.uscourts.gov/judges/hixson-thomas-s-tsh/>.

15 Notice is hereby provided that failure to file a written response will be deemed an
16 admission that Lindblad not intend to prosecute, and the case may be dismissed without prejudice.
17 Thus, it is imperative the Court receive a written response by the deadline above.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 Dated: October 29, 2021

21 
22 THOMAS S. HIXSON
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26
27
28